

CA4 ON HBL W26
85I51

URBAN/MUNICIPAL

THE IMPACT OF CHANGES IN
SELECTION PROCEDURES ON THE
HAMILTON BOARD OF EDUCATION:

A CASE STUDY
BY: DONALD MUSELLA

THE IMPACT OF CHANGES IN SELECTION PROCEDURES ON THE
HAMILTON BOARD OF EDUCATION:
A CASE STUDY

DONALD MUSELLA

January 30, 1985

URBAN MUNICIPAL

APR 6 1989

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

THE IMPACT OF CHANGES IN SELECTION PROCEDURES ON THE HAMILTON BOARD OF EDUCATION: A CASE STUDY

Donald Musella

Background and Perspectives

During the past several years, the Hamilton Board of Education has introduced several changes in the procedures used for the selection and promotion of persons to positions of responsibility. These changes have included: (1) the addition of the assessment center for the selection of principals; (2) the addition of a group problem-solving task for the selection of vice-principals; (3) more extensive representation of constituents on all interview teams; (4) changes in criteria used in selection decisions for all positions; and (5) the training of those persons involved in making the selection decisions.

The basic purpose for the changes was to improve the quality of the selection and promotion decisions. To achieve this, changes in procedures were directed at increasing the amount and use of valid and reliable information on candidates so as to ensure greater objectivity (less subjectivity).

Objectives

The objectives of this study were to assess the impact of these changes on the Hamilton school system and to make recommendations for further changes.

Methods and Data Sources

Given the short span of time between the implementation and data collection stages (two years for the position of principal and one year for the position of vice-principal), as well as the brief time of promoted personnel in the new positions or in the pool of successful candidates, the study was designed to obtain opinions from those

persons in the best position to know of the new procedures and possible impact on the system.

The focus of the study was on the selection of principals and vice-principals. Two questionnaires were developed to elicit information with respect to the procedures used for promotion to these two positions.

Principal questionnaires were mailed to all senior administrators, subject supervisors, elementary and secondary principals and vice-principals, local federation and association presidents, and those trustees who had been involved as members of interview teams. Vice-principal questionnaires were sent to the same persons, plus a sample of teachers. In addition, two persons from each category were interviewed (16 interviews).

One hundred and thirteen (67%) of the principal questionnaires and 137 (60% of the vice-principal questionnaires were returned. (See Tables 1, 2 and 3 in the Appendices.)

Analysis of Data

The questionnaire data were tabulated and are presented in the form of tables (see Appendices). The response to the open-ended questions and the interviews were combined whenever possible. The combined responses are listed in order of priority as determined by the number of times indicated in the questionnaire and interviews, as well as the priority placed on the comments as discerned during the interview.

Results: The Selection of Principals

1. Familiarity and Experience with the Procedures

More than one-half of the respondents indicated some experience, while over 70% indicated "adequate" or "thorough" familiarity with the procedures; however, a significant number indicated "very little" familiarity and "no" experience with the

persons in the best position to know of the new procedures and possible impact on the system.

The focus of the study was on the selection of principals and vice-principals.

Two questionnaires were developed to elicit information with respect to the

procedures used for promotion in these two positions.

Principal questionnaires were mailed to all senior administrative subjects

superior, elementary and secondary principals and vice-principals, local education

and association presidents, and those trustees who had been involved as members of

interview teams. Vice-principal questionnaires were sent to the same persons, plus a

sample of teachers. In addition, two persons from each category were interviewed (the

interview).

One hundred and thirteen (75%) of the principal questionnaires and 127 (88%)

of the vice-principal questionnaires were returned. (See Tables 1, 2 and 3 in the

Appendix.)

Analysis of Data

The questionnaire data were tabulated and are presented in the form of

Tables One through Six. The responses to the open-ended questions and the interviews

were recorded whenever possible. The combined responses are listed in order of

priority as determined by the number of times indicated in the questionnaire and

interviews, as well as the priority placed on the comments in discussing the

interview.

Section Two: Selection of Principals

1. Familiarity and Experience with the Procedures

More than one-half of the respondents indicated some experience with the

1976 selection "procedures" or "processes" familiarly with the procedures; however, a

significant number indicated "very little" familiarity and "not experience with the

procedures. (See Table 4.) These results, along with the relatively low percentage of returns, raise some questions with respect to the validity of the results of the study.

2. Perceptions of Changes Resulting from the Procedures

"Little" to "much" change was indicated by respondents in the following ways:

- (a) increased competition among applicants
- (b) better understanding of Board expectations
- (c) improved administrative and supervisory skills
- (d) improved interpersonal skills
- (e) more objective selection decisions
- (f) higher quality of personnel appointed

A significant number of respondents saw little or no change in "higher quality of applicants." (See Tables 5 and 6.)

3. Familiarity and Experience with the Assessment Center

A majority of respondents indicated "very little" or "no" familiarity or experience with the Assessment Center. (See Table 7.)

4. Strengths of the Procedures Used in the Selection of Principals

The strengths provided are listed in order of the highest to lowest number of responses:

- (a) clearly defined and appropriate criteria
- (b) fair
- (c) consistent
- (d) adequate representation
- (e) extensive information on candidates
- (f) assessment center
- (g) objective
- (h) professional growth through preparation
- (i) feedback provided
- (j) input from principal
- (k) professional and systematic
- (l) opportunity to show leadership qualities
- (m) less emphasis on seniority
- (n) opportunity to be seen in action
- (o) self-evaluation
- (p) comprehensive
- (q) open
- (r) valid

... (The text is very faint and mostly illegible. It appears to be a list or a series of points.)

... (The text is very faint and mostly illegible. It appears to be a list or a series of points.)

... (The text is very faint and mostly illegible. It appears to be a list or a series of points.)

... (The text is very faint and mostly illegible. It appears to be a list or a series of points.)

- 1. ...
- 2. ...
- 3. ...
- 4. ...
- 5. ...
- 6. ...
- 7. ...
- 8. ...
- 9. ...
- 10. ...

... (The text is very faint and mostly illegible. It appears to be a list or a series of points.)

... (The text is very faint and mostly illegible. It appears to be a list or a series of points.)

... (The text is very faint and mostly illegible. It appears to be a list or a series of points.)

... (The text is very faint and mostly illegible. It appears to be a list or a series of points.)

... (The text is very faint and mostly illegible. It appears to be a list or a series of points.)

... (The text is very faint and mostly illegible. It appears to be a list or a series of points.)

... (The text is very faint and mostly illegible. It appears to be a list or a series of points.)

... (The text is very faint and mostly illegible. It appears to be a list or a series of points.)

- 1. ...
- 2. ...
- 3. ...
- 4. ...
- 5. ...
- 6. ...
- 7. ...
- 8. ...
- 9. ...
- 10. ...
- 11. ...
- 12. ...
- 13. ...
- 14. ...
- 15. ...
- 16. ...
- 17. ...
- 18. ...
- 19. ...
- 20. ...
- 21. ...
- 22. ...
- 23. ...
- 24. ...
- 25. ...
- 26. ...
- 27. ...
- 28. ...
- 29. ...
- 30. ...
- 31. ...
- 32. ...
- 33. ...
- 34. ...
- 35. ...
- 36. ...
- 37. ...
- 38. ...
- 39. ...
- 40. ...
- 41. ...
- 42. ...
- 43. ...
- 44. ...
- 45. ...
- 46. ...
- 47. ...
- 48. ...
- 49. ...
- 50. ...
- 51. ...
- 52. ...
- 53. ...
- 54. ...
- 55. ...
- 56. ...
- 57. ...
- 58. ...
- 59. ...
- 60. ...
- 61. ...
- 62. ...
- 63. ...
- 64. ...
- 65. ...
- 66. ...
- 67. ...
- 68. ...
- 69. ...
- 70. ...
- 71. ...
- 72. ...
- 73. ...
- 74. ...
- 75. ...
- 76. ...
- 77. ...
- 78. ...
- 79. ...
- 80. ...
- 81. ...
- 82. ...
- 83. ...
- 84. ...
- 85. ...
- 86. ...
- 87. ...
- 88. ...
- 89. ...
- 90. ...
- 91. ...
- 92. ...
- 93. ...
- 94. ...
- 95. ...
- 96. ...
- 97. ...
- 98. ...
- 99. ...
- 100. ...

5. Weaknesses of the Procedures Used in the Selection of Principals

In all listings, the responses are presented in order of the highest to lowest number:

- (a) emphasis on interview instead of experience and job performance
- (b) lack of useful, candid feedback
- (c) inconsistent application of criteria in relation to secondary school and elementary school differences
- (d) emphasis on representation rather than those with first-hand knowledge
- (e) criteria inappropriate and not clearly specified
- (f) frustrating for unsuccessful candidates
- (g) amount of time for interview
- (h) subjective
- (i) assessors not adequately trained
- (j) too much emphasis on assessment center
- (k) appearance vs. substance
- (l) unfair
- (m) repeating process when no vacancy

6. Recommendations to Improve Principal Selection Procedures

- (a) emphasize actual performance on the job
- (b) reduce representation
- (c) raise qualifications
- (d) clarify criteria
- (e) provide in-service to interview team
- (f) expand representation--parents, principals, students, staff
- (g) de-politicize the process
- (h) reduce the hurdles
- (i) devise system of weighting
- (j) abolish quota system
- (k) make use of "Teacher Development and Evaluation Record"

7. Strengths of the Assessment Center

- (a) more extensive than the interview alone
- (b) more objective
- (c) consistent
- (d) permits assessment under controlled conditions
- (e) good in-service
- (f) effective sorting process
- (g) appropriate simulation of the job
- (h) opportunity to see others perform
- (i) self-evaluation

8. Weaknesses of the Assessment Center

- (a) mock situation, game
- (b) pressure--competition rather than cooperation
- (c) time-consuming
- (d) useless feedback, should come from team

- (e) no serious weaknesses
- (f) artificial
- (g) over-emphasis on assessment center
- (h) used for selection rather than development
- (i) expectations unclear

9. Impact of the Assessment Center on the Hamilton Board

- (a) helps selection process
- (b) no difference
- (c) depends on follow-up
- (d) quality of applicant and performance improved
- (e) expectations and objectives clear
- (f) creates a "class" society
- (g) creates a morale problem
- (h) better quality of administrators selected
- (i) healthy competition
- (j) creates pressure

10. Recommendations to Improve the Assessment Center

- (a) include actual performance
- (b) provide more information on procedures, rules, outcomes
- (c) use for in-service and professional development
- (d) use only when vacancies
- (e) reduce stress
- (f) better feedback
- (g) continue to refine materials

11. Extent to which New Selection Procedures (Principalship) Foster Growth and Development

Most of the respondents indicated that the new procedures fostered growth and development "little" or "much." (See Table 8.)

In response to the request for ways in which the procedures do or do not foster growth and development, the respondents indicated the following comments:

DO

- (a) improves skills
- (b) provides honest feedback
- (c) staff becoming more critical
- (d) awareness of expectations leading to better preparation
- (e) fosters self evaluation
- (f) fosters setting personal objectives
- (g) motivational
- (h) emphasizes quality
- (i) encourage frank and open discussions

DO NOT

- (a) provides inadequate feedback
- (b) too much stress and competition
- (c) deters potential candidates
- (d) too narrow a focus

Results: The Selection of Vice-Principals

1. Familiarity and Experience with the Procedures

Approximately one-half of the respondents indicated "adequate" or "thorough" familiarity and had some experience with the procedures. A significant number indicated "no" familiarity and had "no" experience with the procedures for selecting vice-principals. (See Table 9.)

2. Perceptions of Changes Resulting from the Procedures

"Little" to "much" change was indicated by respondents in the following ways:

- (a) higher quality of applicants
- (b) increased competition among applicants
- (c) better understanding of board expectations
- (d) improved administrative and supervisory skills
- (e) improved interpersonal skills
- (f) improved performance on the job
- (g) more objective selection decisions
- (h) higher quality of personal appointments

A small percentage of principals, vice-principals and teacher respondents indicated "no" change. (See Tables 10 and 11.)

3. Strengths of Procedures Used in the Selection of Vice-Principals

- (a) comprehensive (more than interview)
- (b) fair
- (c) constant, standardized
- (d) objective
- (e) adequate representation
- (f) criteria clearly defined and appropriate
- (g) procedures clearly specified
- (h) feedback
- (i) developmental
- (j) self-evaluation
- (k) assessment center
- (l) professional approach
- (m) chance to see others in action
- (n) superintendents involved
- (o) contact with district personnel
- (p) group interview positive
- (q) principal required to know teachers
- (r) equal opportunity

4. Weaknesses of Procedures Used in the Selection of Vice-Principals

- (a) feedback confusing, frustrating, not honest and open, too little
- (b) limited criteria
- (c) inadequate emphasis on performance
- (d) criteria not clear
- (e) no carry-over from one year to another
- (f) too much emphasis on the interview
- (g) politics: who knows who
- (h) too artificial
- (i) interview threatening
- (j) inconsistent
- (k) essay seems redundant
- (l) committee hasn't done homework

5. Recommendations to Improve Vice-Principal Selection Procedures

- (a) increase awareness of procedures and qualifications
- (b) emphasize actual performance and experience
- (c) less emphasis on interview
- (d) expand representation--principal, peers, parents
- (e) interview team should get to know the candidates
- (f) simplify the process
- (g) more emphasis on interpersonal and social skills
- (h) develop in-service for principals and vice-principals
- (i) continue short list for two years

6. Extent to Which New Selection Procedures (Vice-Principalship) Foster Growth and Development

A majority of respondents indicated that the new procedures fostered growth and development "little" or "much." However, a significant number indicated "not at all." (See Table 12.) In response to the request for ways in which the procedures do or do not foster growth and development, the respondents indicated the following comments:

DO

- (a) professional and personal growth
- (b) improved feedback
- (c) improved interview skills
- (d) interaction with others
- (e) knowledge of whole system
- (f) encourage active preparation
- (g) improved understanding of boards expectations
- (h) improved school climate
- (i) encourage to undertake activities to increase own experiences and improve own knowledge and skills

DO NOT

- (a) potential candidates intimidated
- (b) insufficient leadership development
- (c) stress and frustration

Results: Department Head

Data not requested on the questionnaire was obtained during the interview with respect to the promotion to department head. Most interviewers indicated that they knew little or nothing about this procedure. Those that did referred to the improvement of procedures over the years through better representation. Concern was expressed by the failure to select members of the interview teams who had little expertise or experience regarding the areas of expertise and experience of the candidate.

Conclusion

The impact of the changes in selection procedures on the Hamilton Board of Education has yet to be felt beyond the perceptions of various personnel of the procedures themselves. The main reason is an obvious one; that is, the new procedures have been in place only one to two years. Consequently, those promoted to new positions have not been in these positions long enough to expect differences (changes) at the school level. Further, because of the "newness" of the procedures, the number of persons with little or no familiarity or experience with the procedures exceeds, quite significantly, what one would expect from persons in positions of responsibility in the Board.

Therefore, the results of the study focus almost entirely on the perceptions of the respondents of the policy and procedures themselves. This focus, the implementation of the new procedures, has resulted in much useful data with respect to the value placed on the procedures as well as on recommendations for change.

A summary of the results is as follows:

- (1) there is a general lack of familiarity with the procedures by a significant number of personnel, including those in positions of responsibility;

- (2) satisfaction with the new procedures far outweighs dissatisfaction regarding both the process and the outcomes;
- (3) the impact of the procedures on changes in the system is seen as positive and significant;
- (4) there is considerable concern over the lack of adequate communication about policy and procedures and the excessive level of competition and stress placed on candidates;
- (5) there is a general consensus on recommendations for several significant changes to present procedures:
 - (a) improve communication of procedures and criteria and outcomes
 - (b) more emphasis placed on experience and "track record"
 - (c) less emphasis on the interview alone.

Because of the limitations of time of implementation of new selection policies and procedures, and because of the long-range implications for changes in the selection of persons to positions of responsibility, it is recommended that evaluation data continue to be collected each year on the implementation process, but that, at the end of five years, data be collected to assess the impact of the selection decisions on the school--the students, staff and program.

Table 1

NUMBER AND CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL SENT AND RETURNED PRINCIPAL QUARTERS

Category	Number Sent	No. & % Returned
Supervisory Officers ¹	18	4 (22)
Supervisors ²	25	18 (72)
Principals	35	27 (77)
First Principals	10	12 (60)
Teachers	7	
Others ³	6	3
Total	113	64 (57)

APPENDICES

¹Members of Academic Council Includes the Director and Superintendent

²Subject supervisors in central office

³Position not indicated

Table 1

NUMBER AND CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL SENT AND
RETURNED PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRES

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number Sent</u>	<u>No. & % Returned</u>
Supervisory Officers ¹	10	4 (40)
Supervisors ²	22	16 (73)
Principals	90	67 (74)
Vice-Principals	40	19 (48)
Trustees	3	
Others ³	0	7
Totals	165	113 (67)

¹Members of Academic Council (includes the Director and Superintendents)

²Subject supervisors in central office

³Position not indicated

Table 2

NUMBER AND CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL SENT AND RETURNED
VICE-PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRES

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number Sent</u>	<u>No. & % Returned</u>
Supervisory Officers ¹	10	4 (40)
Supervisors ²	22	11 (55)
Principals	90	37 (41)
Vice-Principals	40	19 (48)
Trustees	3	0
Teachers ³	65	59 (91)
Others ⁴	0	7
Totals	230	137 (60)

¹Members of Academic Council (includes the Director and Superintendents)

²Subject supervisors in central office

³Applicants for positions of responsibility (Department Head, Assistant Head, Vice-Principal)

⁴Position not indicated

Table 3

NUMBER AND CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL INTERVIEWED

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number</u>
Supervisory Officers	2
Supervisors	2
Trustees	2
Secondary Principals	2
Elementary Principals	1
Secondary Vice-Principals	1
Elementary Vice-Principals	1
Federation Officers	2
Teachers	2
Staff Development Officer	1
Total	16

Table 4

FAMILIARITY WITH POLICY AND PROCEDURES USED
FOR THE SELECTION OF PRINCIPALS

	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>Very Little</u>	<u>Adequately</u>	<u>Thoroughly</u>
Principals	1	18	37	11
Vice-Principals	0	2	8	9
Supervisors	0	10	5	1
Supervisory Officers	0	0	0	4
Others	1	1	4	0
Totals	2	31	54	25

EXPERIENCE WITH THE NEW PROCEDURES USED
FOR THE SELECTION OF PRINCIPALS

	<u>None</u>	<u>In Development</u>	<u>In Interviewing</u>	<u>In Recommendations</u>	<u>In Other</u>
Principals	34	1	8	17	7
Vice-Principals	5	1	1	1	12
Supervisors	7	1	2	5	2
Supervisory Officers	0	4	3	3	2
Others	4	0	2	0	0
Totals	50	7	16	26	23

Table 5

PRINCIPALS' AND VICE-PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF CHANGES RESULTING
FROM NEW PROCEDURES FOR THE SELECTION OF PRINCIPALS

	<u>None</u>		<u>Little</u>		<u>Much</u>	
	<u>P</u>	<u>VP</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>VP</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>VP</u>
Higher quality of applicants	12	6	22	6	15	2
Increased competition among applicants	1	1	17	4	38	12
Better understanding of Board expectations	2	1	27	9	29	6
Improved administrative & supervisory skills	4	1	29	12	14	3
Improved interpersonal skills	7	3	27	9	15	3
Improved performance on the job	13	3	23	10	10	2
More objective selection decisions	5	1	27	9	13	4
Higher quality of personnel appointments	6	4	27	5	10	3
Totals	50	20	199	64	144	35

P = Principals
VP = Vice-Principals

Table 6

SUPERVISORS', SUPERVISORY OFFICERS' AND OTHERS' PERCEPTIONS
OF CHANGES RESULTING FROM NEW PROCEDURES FOR
THE SELECTION OF PRINCIPALS

	None			Little			Much		
	<u>S</u>	<u>SO</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>SO</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>SO</u>	<u>O</u>
Higher quality of applicants	1	1	0	3	1	2	3	2	1
Increased competition among applicants	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	3	3
Better understanding of Board expectations	0	0	0	5	1	2	5	3	2
Improved administrative & supervisory skills	1	0	0	3	2	3	5	2	1
Improved interpersonal skills	2	0	0	2	2	2	4	2	1
Improved performance on the job	0	0	0	2	3	2	5	1	1
More objective selection decisions	0	0	1	2	1	1	7	3	1
Higher quality of personnel appointments	1	0	0	3	3	1	6	1	3
Totals	5	1	1	21	14	14	40	17	13

S = Supervisors
SO = Supervisory Officers
O = Others

Table 7

FAMILIARITY WITH THE ASSESSMENT CENTER

	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>Very Little</u>	<u>Adequately</u>	<u>Thoroughly</u>
Principals	11	33	18	5
Vice-Principals	0	5	6	7
Supervisors	2	10	1	0
Supervisory Officers	0	1	0	3
Others	1	5	0	0
Totals	14	54	25	15

EXPERIENCE WITH THE ASSESSMENT CENTER

	<u>None</u>	<u>In Development</u>	<u>In Interviewing</u>	<u>In Recommendations</u>	<u>In Other</u>
Principals	46	1	3	9	6
Vice-Principals	5	0	0	1	10
Supervisors	1	1	1	1	1
Supervisory Officers	1	3	1	2	1
Others	3	0	1	0	0
Totals	56	5	9	13	18

Table 8

EXTENT TO WHICH NEW SELECTION PROCEDURES (PRINCIPALSHIP)
FOSTER GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>Little</u>	<u>Much</u>
Principals	2	24	18
Vice-Principals	1	7	8
Supervisors	0	0	3
Supervisory Officers	0	1	3
Others	0	0	1
Totals	3	32	33

Table 9

FAMILIARITY WITH POLICY AND PROCEDURES USED FOR THE
SELECTION OF VICE-PRINCIPALS

	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>Very Little</u>	<u>Adequately</u>	<u>Thoroughly</u>
Principals	1	15	15	6
Vice-Principals	0	3	4	12
Teachers	7	27	17	8
Supervisors	2	5	2	2
Supervisory Officers	0	0	0	4
Others	0	3	0	0
Totals	10	53	38	32

EXPERIENCE WITH THE NEW PROCEDURES USED FOR THE
SELECTION OF VICE-PRINCIPALS

	<u>None</u>	<u>In Development</u>	<u>In Interviewing</u>	<u>In Recommendations</u>	<u>In Other</u>
Principals	19	1	8	12	0
Vice-Principals	6	1	3	1	9
Teachers	37	1	1	2	18
Supervisors	6	2	2	1	0
Supervisory Officers	0	3	3	4	1
Others	1	0	0	0	0
Totals	69	8	17	20	28

Table 10

VICE-PRINCIPALS', PRINCIPALS' AND TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF
CHANGES RESULTING FROM NEW PROCEDURES FOR THE
SELECTION OF VICE-PRINCIPALS

	None			Little			Much		
	<u>VP</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>VP</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>VP</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>T</u>
Higher quality of applicants	5	7	5	9	8	20	1	10	10
Increased competition among applicants	2	0	1	6	11	7	8	20	25
Better understanding of Board expectations	0	2	4	10	10	18	7	16	15
Improved administrative & supervisory skills	4	4	7	10	16	20	2	5	8
Improved interpersonal skills	4	4	5	6	13	21	6	7	11
Improved performance on the job	6	4	7	7	12	15	2	6	9
More objective selection decisions	3	4	9	8	14	19	5	6	4
Higher quality of personnel appointments	2	4	12	8	14	17	5	7	4
Totals	26	29	50	64	98	137	36	77	86

VP = Vice-Principals

P = Principals

T = Teachers

Table 11

SUPERVISORS', SUPERVISORY OFFICERS' AND OTHERS' PERCEPTIONS
OF CHANGES RESULTING FROM NEW PROCEDURES FOR THE
SELECTION OF VICE-PRINCIPALS

	None		Little		Much	
	<u>S</u>	<u>SO</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>SO</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>SO</u>
Higher quality of applicants	0	0	3	3	2	1
Increased competition among applicants	0	0	1	1	4	3
Better understanding of Board expectations	0	0	1	2	4	2
Improved administrative & supervisory skills	0	0	2	1	2	3
Improved interpersonal skills	0	0	2	2	4	2
Improved performance on the job	0	0	2	1	1	3
More objective selection decisions	0	0	2	2	3	2
Higher quality of personnel appointments	0	0	3	2	2	2
Totals	0	0	16	14	26	18

S = Supervisors

SO = Supervisory Officers

No response from "Others"

Table 12

EXTENT TO WHICH NEW SELECTION PROCEDURES (VICE-PRINCIPALSHIP)
FOSTER GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>Little</u>	<u>Much</u>
Vice-Principals	3	5	6
Principals	2	18	5
Teachers	8	20	14
Supervisors	1	2	3
Supervisory Officers	1	0	3
Others	0	0	1
Totals	15	45	32

HAMILTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 2022 21335803 5

Library
12380